



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/733,459

12/10/2003

Dan Teodosiu

14917.0456USU1

8789

27488 7590 09/23/2008  
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

LY, CHEYNE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/733,459	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TEODOSIU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHEYNE D. LY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHEYNE D. LY. (3) Tim Scull for Applicant.

(2) Jack Bradley for Applicant. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shakib and Miloushey.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the prior art of record as directed to claim 1. Examiner has provided explanation in regard the interpretation of the Shakib and Miloushey as directed to the limitation of fence value recited in claim 1. Further, Examiner has pointed out that the recitation of "changing content..." does not necessary support that assertion that the claimed invention is directed to a conflict resolution using the fence value.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Cheyne D Ly/ Examiner, Art Unit 2168	
--	--